

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. IV, No. 21

December 11, 1944

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Peace-Time Conscription

IN the current discussion of conscription one thing is clear: no action should be taken now to commit the nation to a permanent policy of peace-time conscription. If the reason for the attempt to rush through legislation is the fear that after the war Americans would be unwilling to consent to it, such a procedure is highly questionable. It is unfair in that our service men can have no part in the national debate. It is unwise because the problems of long term military security and the problems of education that are involved are too complicated to be solved in haste. If we must come to peace-time conscription it is important that the best possible provisions be made for it from an educational point of view. The almost unanimous protest by the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, against the early enactment of legislation on this subject is entirely justified.

While we agree with those who counsel delay in deciding this question, we do not agree with those who oppose conscription in peace or war on absolute religious or moral grounds. They may oppose it because they are pacifists. They may oppose it because their individualism denies the right of the nation to conscript its citizens. Those two motives are often very closely inter-related. The most important practical difference is that those who are primarily pacifists can accept some non-military type of training under civilian auspices as a substitute. Those who are primarily individualists would have difficulty in accepting such a substitute if it were required by the state. If America does adopt peace-time conscription we shall urge that provision be made for conscientious objectors of both types. We see more justification from the Christian point of view for the pacifists than for the individualists (some of the latter are such pure anarchists that no possible concessions will meet their case), but it is a spiritual wound to the community to punish any sincere person for the sake of conscience. It is a bad omen that neither of the bills now before Congress makes provision for conscientious objectors.

Whether or not peace-time conscription will be necessary depends on conditions which we cannot now foresee. It is a mistake to oppose conscription on the assumption that unilateral disarmament is

either possible or desirable after this war. It is also a mistake to look with complacency on a world in which all nations must resort to conscription to have a semblance of security. Collective security will depend upon military force in part but it will probably fail in a world that is armed to the teeth. The use of force for police purposes under such conditions is likely to start a general conflagration. Competitive armaments do undercut the mutual confidence that is necessary to make a collective security system work. However, pending a drastic reduction of armaments by all nations it is an open question whether a continuance of conscription would be the best way to raise the army that our nation will demand. The issue is confused. Not only are there social arguments against and military arguments for conscription, there are also social arguments for conscription as the most democratic method of raising a large army and there are military arguments against conscription based upon preference for a highly selected and technically trained military force. It is also well to avoid the illusion shared by some Americans that military conscription marks an advance in civilization. The goal should be the deliverance of all nations from the burden of it.

President Roosevelt suggests that he may favor a policy of compulsory national training that is not primarily military. There is much to be said for this as a plan for providing another year of education to all of our citizens, as a means of improving the nation's health and as an influence on the side of national unity and democracy. It would also have military value indirectly. But to set up such a program in haste would be a great mistake because the value of a year of training will depend upon its educational content and upon its relation to the work of school, college and church. It could be a very boring and wasteful experience. It could be an effort to mould the character of Americans along the lines of a false nationalism. It could be a creative extension of our educational opportunities; but this last result would be the hardest to achieve at any time and war-time conditions would provide the worst possible beginning.

J. C. B.

The British Churches and the Education Act^{*}

A. JOHN DREWETT

THE Church in Britain was a pioneer in elementary as in university^{*} education and this early interest has been maintained throughout the 74 years of compulsory education. Of the 20,910 public elementary schools in this country, 9,068 belong to the Anglican Church, 1,252 to the Roman Church, 121 to the Methodist Church and 13 to the Jews. There are 1,522,000 children in these "non-provided" schools and 3,513,000 in the schools provided by the State. From these figures it will be deduced that the church schools are, on the whole, smaller than the state schools, the reason being that they include most of the village schools and those in the poorer and older parts of our cities—areas which have been largely cleared of population during the past twenty years. This system, whereby public education has been jointly provided by the state and the churches is known as the "dual" system and has been responsible in the past for administrative difficulties which have made the passage of education acts a very complicated and controversial process.

Apart from their vested interest in education, there is another reason why the churches have been deeply interested in the present educational reforms. Christians have become increasingly aware of the grave injustice in the present system. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Free Church leaders have made it clear from the first that neither the Anglican nor the Free Churches would hinder the passage of the Bill because the interests of the country, the children and common justice demanded that the school age should be raised and the system re-organized as soon as possible. The wastage caused by a leaving age of 14 both to the country and to the individual child can hardly be estimated. It was made clear to the country and to the government at an important meeting in London on the eve of the presentation of the Bill in Parliament that the Anglican and Free Churches would not press any amendment which would jeopardize its passage through the Commons. There seldom has been a major measure in education which has gone as smoothly through the Legislature and the Minister of Education has been widely complimented on his patience and tact. Mr. Butler took infinite pains to discover in advance the reactions of all interested

parties and all their legitimate interests were carefully considered in the drafting of the Measure. He not only received deputations from public bodies and professional associations but went round the country addressing local groups of teachers, of clergy and of the general public. The result is that the Act has been given an enthusiastic reception by all, and not least by the churches.

We shall now give a brief account of the main provisions of the Education Act 1944, and then summarize the attitude of the churches towards it.

The present position is that education in this country is compulsory between the ages of five and fourteen. This elementary education is free for all. At the age of eleven the child can, by passing an examination, proceed to a secondary school, where he may stay until he is eighteen. Since 1931 secondary education has been subject to a means test. Those who can afford to contribute to their child's education have to do so. The "Public Schools" and some old Grammar Schools (known technically as Direct Grant Schools) admit pupils on an entrance examination of their own and their fees are higher than in schools administered by the Local Education Authorities.

The main changes proposed under the new Act are as follows:

1. Nursery schools will be provided for children from two to five but attendance at them will be voluntary.
2. From five to eleven years of age, the child will attend a junior school.
3. At the age of eleven, the child will undergo a test to discover his ability and aptitude and will proceed to one of three types of secondary school to be called Grammar, Technical and Modern Schools. The Grammar School curriculum will be similar to that of the present secondary school and will prepare for the professions, for the civil service and for business. The Technical Schools will be for those with a proved aptitude for technical subjects and will train technicians. The Modern School will cater for those who show no special aptitude in either of the other directions and will aim at producing well-balanced people who can live satisfying lives both at work and in their leisure time.
4. No child will be allowed to leave the secondary school until he is fifteen (to be raised to sixteen as soon as practicable) and if he leaves before he is eighteen he will be required to attend a "County

^{*}This article is the first of a series of articles on distinctive religious problems in Britain and on the continent. We shall subsequently present articles by British authors on the sentiment of British Churches on International Reconstruction and Social Reconstruction.

College" on at least one day a week until he attains his eighteenth birthday. These colleges will also be used in the evenings as Youth Clubs on a voluntary basis.

5. School meals and milk are to be provided free in all schools. Medical and dental inspection and treatment will also be provided.

6. All "private" schools are to be subject to inspection by the Ministry of Education and are to be required to maintain an efficient standard.

With regard to Religious Education, the Act makes the following provisions. Both state and denominational schools are to remain, the former to be called "County" schools, the latter "Auxiliary" schools. These will be of three types depending on the amount of financial support given by the church authorities. If the church is prepared to pay half the cost of improvements, alterations and external repairs, the Managers can appoint the teachers and arrange for denominational instruction as they wish. Such a school will be called an "Aided" school. In the case of schemes submitted by the churches for new schools authorized by Act of 1936 (of which it is still proposed to proceed with 482), the schools will be known as "Special Agreement" schools. In these schools the local authority appoints the teachers but there are to be "reserved" teachers, approved by the Managers, for denominational instruction. In cases where the Managers are unable or unwilling to pay half the cost of alterations and maintenance of premises, they can hand the school over to the local authority and it then becomes a "Controlled" school. In these schools the local authority appoints the teachers, but consults the managers regarding headships, and "reserved" (i.e., denominational) teachers are provided up to one-fifth of the staff. Denominational teaching can be given to those who want it on two mornings a week, and "agreed syllabus" instruction (explained later) on the other mornings.

The Act does not deal in any way with the universities and hardly at all with the "Public" schools. It does give power to local authorities to set up boarding schools for children who are likely to benefit from residential education. There is a move to open the doors of the "Public" schools to a percentage of children from state schools but such arrangements will be purely voluntary on the part of the governors of the schools. (A "Public" school in England is, as is well known, a select and expensive private school. Most, but not all, of these schools are boarding schools and they are outside the state system of education. Under the new Act they will be subject to inspection by the Ministry of Education.)

The Anglican Church is, on the whole, satisfied with the Act and considers that the government has given it a square deal. Some people were relieved to find that the Dual System was to be preserved and saw in the Act's provisions a challenge to the

church to bring her schools up to the standard required by modern education. The principle of the Act is, as we have seen, that the more the voluntary bodies contribute, the greater will be their powers and this is acknowledged to be a fair way of dealing with the problem. There was, it is true, a certain amount of opposition from the Anglo-Catholic wing which argued that the church should agitate for a 100% grant for new schools (or the re-planning of existing ones where possible) on the grounds that a minority, if large enough, should be entitled, as taxpayers, to its own schools.

The Roman Church carried out a sustained opposition to the financial proposals in the Bill, using the same arguments as the Anglo-Catholics. In one sense they had a stronger case, for they do insist on their children going to their own schools, whereas, it is probably true to say that more Anglican children attend council schools than church schools! The Romans argued that they were being asked to pay twice over for the education of their children, since as taxpayers they were supporting council schools, whilst as churchmen they were supporting their own schools. In fact, of course, even in a denominational school, only the cost of maintaining the fabric is borne by the church; all the equipment, heating, lighting and salaries are found by the state. The Minister insisted that all the denominations were to be treated alike and the Romans accepted the position, not pressing their demands to the point of a division.

The Free Churches have never considered the school to be the place where denominational instruction should be given and have been satisfied with syllabus instruction supplemented by the Sunday School. Their main grievance is the "single-school area." There are 4,000 areas in the country where there is only a denomination school (with hardly an exception, Anglican) and Free Churchmen object very much to this injustice of having to send their children to a school run by another denomination. The Church of England has tried to meet this by offering Free Church ministers access to the schools to teach their own children or alternately to provide for their withdrawal for the period of religious instruction.

Now that the Act has become law, the churches are making plans for the efficient teaching of religious knowledge in the schools for it is rightly recognized that without teachers who are willing and able to teach the subject it is useless making provision for it in the time-table. The main requirements are a good syllabus, instructed and sincere teachers and adequate supplies of good, up-to-date reference and text books.

The Act lays down that instruction in "provided" schools shall be according to an "agreed" syllabus; i.e., a syllabus agreed upon by the churches, the

Local Education Authority and the teachers. For some years past, a number of these syllabi have been in use and they have proved their worth in practice. They are based upon the Bible and contain no doctrinal teaching which is distinctive of a particular denomination. This means that the Apostles' Creed can be taught but not, for example, the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. In Church of England schools, the Church Catechism is taught in addition to the agreed syllabus, where an agreed syllabus is used. In some church quarters there has been a good deal of uninformed criticism about the "watery" nature of syllabus instruction. The fact is that if the teacher is a convinced Christian, the syllabus will be a great help in the presentation of systematic teaching and the children will be exposed to the power of the Christian faith. Where the teacher is not a Christian, no syllabus, however good, will compensate for an unreal and unhappy situation. Better no religious instruction than a sham.

This brings us to the question of able and willing teachers. Teachers in this country are trained either in the universities or in the special Teacher Training Colleges. Graduate teachers usually get posts in the secondary schools if they have a good degree. It is presumed that both the Technical and the Grammar Schools will be staffed by graduate teachers and that some will be found in the Modern Schools. Probably the majority of the teachers in the Modern Schools and all those in the Junior and Infant Schools will come from the Training Colleges. The standard of entry to the Training Colleges is a School Certificate and the course has been a two-year one. This is to be extended to three years as soon as possible. The Training Colleges are mostly residential and are governed either by the Local Education Authority (Municipal Training Colleges) or by the churches (Church Training Colleges). The churches are thinking out plans both to increase the number of recruits to the profession from their ranks, and also to improve the colleges for which they are responsible. Now that Religious Knowledge can be offered as a subject for the Teacher's Certificate, all the training colleges (Church and Municipal) are offering courses in it and, so far as can be gathered, the response is quite promising. In addition to these facilities for teachers in training, courses are being held throughout the country for teachers already in the schools. These are usually residential and last for two weeks. They are run for the Board of Education by the Institute of Christian Education, an interdenominational society.

There are those (and there are Christians and non-Christians among them) who look with suspicion upon the somewhat unexpected enthusiasm on the part of the state for religion in the schools. They wonder whether the reason is a deep-seated fear of revolutionary ideas and a reading of the

Conservative Party Sub-committee's Report on Education rather confirms this suspicion. The Teachers' Unions, also, are apprehensive about religious tests for teachers and take a lot of re-assuring that those of their profession who refuse to teach scripture on conscientious grounds will not be penalized by losing promotion. There are some Christians who fear a kind of state religion called "Christianity" but containing only those Christian virtues which the state considers will produce the kind of character-type it desires.

The CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER (Editor, Dr. J. H. Oldham) has done a great deal to guide Christian opinion on the subject of education. In particular it has continued to stress the difference between Christian Education and Religious Instruction. Unless Christian values are being imparted continuously in the school and unless the school is aiming at becoming a Christian community, religious instruction will do more harm than good. Education is a personal relationship between teacher and child and between each child and his fellows. It is therefore religious in the strict sense. But a true personal relationship is well-nigh impossible in classes of fifty or more. For this reason Christian educationalists believe that while there is a shortage of teachers, smaller classes should take priority over the raising of the school age and that for a school to be a real community it should probably not have more than 250-300 children.

The other question which is worrying the more far-sighted educationalists is the grading of the children at eleven into Grammar, Technical and Modern Schools. Christian education (or liberal education) should produce whole *persons*; early specialization savors too much of the functional. Christians should oppose any attempt to educate children at this age for a function in society and should insist on a broad, humane education up to the age of fifteen at least. Nothing could be more disastrous than for the new schools to produce bureaucrats, technicians and machine-minders rather than sane and healthy persons with some conception of the true end of man.

Groups of educationalists in all the churches are emphasizing that true Christian education will only be achieved by a close working partnership between school, home and church and this in turn demands a widespread interest in education on the part of the rank and file of the churches. Too long has education been considered the special province of professional teachers. A beginning has been made by the National Society (the Central Council of the Church of England for Education) in the running of Education Weeks in parishes in different parts of the country but no real progress will be made until the whole church takes much more seriously the responsibility of the education of the young.

Anglo-American Economic Relations

CHARLES P. TAFT

OUR business, industrial and commercial relations are in a thoroughly planned and tightly controlled economy, organized for total war. The State Department is concerned with the implications for our foreign relations of these controls in so far as they affect our foreign trade.

The War Production Board divides up that part of the cake of scarce materials which involves industrial products, while the War Food Administration does the same for the products of agriculture, each covering what comes from the United States, and what the United States gets from the outside. But of many foods and raw materials we produce a surplus—a surplus at least sufficient to meet more pressing needs from abroad; and after the American and British supply authorities in Combined Food Board, Combined Raw Materials Board and Combined Production and Resources Board, recommend how much should go to other areas or come from them, the United States allocating authorities, the War Production Board and War Food Administration, allocate export items from our production.

The civilian part of these materials goes abroad only on export license, which may be a broad authority that releases all of a particular kind of thing easily available, or it may be an individual license for each shipment of a scarce commodity. Licenses are adjusted not only to allocations but to availability of shipping.

Strategic materials from abroad, when really scarce, are controlled in various ways, by the import orders of the War Production Board, or by an agreement with the government of the country from which they come, which gives us the entire exportable surplus. And, of course, imports are limited by shipping considerations, just like exports. These government-to-government arrangements will also include a price schedule to avoid runaway markets for the buyer or inflation for the seller in its domestic market.

Price considerations on a scarce article stops the United States and the United Kingdom from bidding against each other, and one or the other is given the job. So there you are with assignments of markets, price fixing, government purchasing between monopoly buyers and monopoly sellers and quotas. We have arrived at a point in many commercial dealings that involve tight shipping or short supply which is straight state trading of a socialized economy. We had to, in order to save our national lives.

One further element is the exchange problem. Great Britain has supplied herself and fought the war with all her resources, but also with the re-

sources of the Colonies, the Dominions and India. In a word, of the British Empire. This has only been possible by paying in pounds sterling, and upon the conditions that the pounds shall be used in England only. Some day the creditors will want the blocked sterling pounds. England has a certain amount of dollars which she has to hoard in order to pay for what she has to buy in the United States over and above lend lease. So that when our exporters want to send goods to some one of the empire areas, they can only be paid in dollars if the British Treasury has any extra. And our exporters, most of them, don't want pounds in London, for they have little they want to buy there.

How do we get out of those controls and back to the kind of free world we all want? When the war ends we know that the cessation of shooting ends the horrible waste that goes into the maw of destruction. In the course of time ships will be free and most shortages will be replaced by surpluses. But the trade controls will not stop automatically—that takes intelligent and directed effort, an effort that is not only essential, but whose failure may destroy all our hopes for peace and freedom. In fact, these controls are economic warfare, and, in the end, as with Germany, they help to bring real war.

There is a well spoken and sometimes bitter dissatisfaction with so much concern and talk about oil and gold and shipping, with factual situations, with so much bickering about trade and commerce and hauling and transportation. An appealing cry arises for a peace of ideas, represented by words like liberty, freedom and democracy, revolutionary words never usable to protect an evil *status quo*. I can understand that point of view. When it is said that Karl Marx took God out of history, I cry, No, and say with Jaurès that while we are all profoundly affected by the way we earn our living, great crises in history are decided in the end by ideas of liberty and justice.

But you can't separate ideas and words from the facts of life, especially from the economic status of nations. Nations must be governed through politicians, whose opportunity to govern at all must be dependent on the support of their people. Politicians are the salvage men of government. They come in after revolution and have to rebuild what is left. Hamilton, Adams, Jefferson and Madison were that kind of politicians, with ideals, but with a realization that it takes time to achieve them, and a very keen understanding of the place of trade, industry and finance.

On the other end from the idealists are the pessi-

mists who say, Oh, yes the liberal trade policies of Secretary Hull are all right in theory, but in fact we are in for a world of barter, export and import controls, exchange management, and quotas. The elimination of trade barriers is our goal, they say, but in the meantime we must have vigorous government protection for our business men abroad in the transition period.

All this is not only rather condescending to Mr. Hull but it is the kind of defeatism that lets the world slide back into the morass from which we are trying to pull ourselves. Also it contemplates a trade battle of giants between the United States and Great Britain, each government dealing through its traders in a great warfare of trade and commerce.

That program the Department of State cannot accept. The same kind of talk greeted the beginnings of the program of reciprocal trade agreements ten years ago. In spite of the same kind of opposition the program worked, and made the first intelligent, and, on the whole, non-political reduction in trade barriers in our history, with a corresponding increase in beneficial exchanges of goods.

Now we need a similar act of faith, and Great Britain is the country whose support we must have in getting away from this economic warfare in trade controls. The rest of the world can manage with one great state trading nation (Russia), but not with two. There are very strong elements in the United Kingdom who feel that England must go to a barter economy after the war to save its very life. Others, equally influential, support the trade policies which are the official program of this Government, with strong bi-partisan support. But those who support our position are up against real problems in the United Kingdom after hostilities stop. There is the threatened avalanche of claims for blocked sterling in payment of war debts. Equally serious is the necessity for Britain to export in order to pay for the things her people must have to live. Their imports are their life blood which the Germans have tried in two wars to choke off by a submarine blockade, as Napoleon tried nearly a hundred and fifty years ago, to choke England by a different kind of blockade. And they can only get that lifeblood by exporting their manufactures and services to pay for it. They are willing to get that support from us, which we can supply to a considerable degree, but we have to take in payment their manufactures and services.

The British are exporting now so far as it does not interfere with the war effort, just as we are, in order to reduce their mounting war costs, but what they ship out is far below prewar, much farther below than United States trade. Our exporters think the British are jumping the gun, and their exporters are equally certain we are making it impossible for them to get back their markets.

Neither view is accurate. Equally wrong is the

battle of giants theory. The place of governments is to see that their nationals are not discriminated against, but we have no business to make trade competition an argument between governments. One difficulty is that the private enterprisers themselves often want just that, a government intervention that gets them the contract.

Our first objective is to eliminate our trade controls as fast as they are no longer necessary for the prosecution of the war. Immediately that runs us into efforts of foreign countries to prevent wartime, or transitional, inflation, and their feeling that they must keep or put on new controls for that purpose.

So our second objective is to devise a system for prompt and friendly discussion, with the British especially, through which we can work out this basic transitional problem effectively and promptly.

But one of the most important objectives must be for each country to study sympathetically the financial and commercial problem of the other, in the light of its own longtime interests and to work out measures in each country which can form the basis for world trade among them, and the basis for approaches to the other trading nations for similar trade.

There are two theories of our relation to Great Britain in connection with the war. One is that this war is Britain's war, not ours really. We do want Britain to win, however, and so we give them the extra push, the extra men, the extra equipment and supplies to supplement their effort. We expect them to spend themselves empty, empty of vigor, empty of resources, empty of their young men's lives, while we spend only the supplement we give them that they need. Any surplus comes back to us. That theory seems to me profoundly immoral. It leads to argument about the percentage of Americans on some particular European front compared to British. It leads to demands for the control and domination of British finance after the war, because they have used their resources, and owe us the balance. It means the end of any Anglo-American friendship and collaboration.

The other theory is that we are partners. That reflects our actual operations. We have pooled our resources and our men, and we try to share the destruction and wastage of war, because we are engaged in a common effort to maintain the elements of our civilization, in which we cooperate even in matters of mutual irritability. Yes, there are evil things in our civilization, and certainly there are events in the history of both countries which do not measure up to our best ideals. Some of our allies may have a different political tradition. But our two countries have in different ways built up the content of the democratic ideal for human existence, and our common opponents in this war have dragged it down and threatened our own existence. Individuals

from each of our nations are shortsighted and irritating to the other nation, but our past and our future are inextricably linked.

We must win this war together, and we must

work together in political and economic matters for a peaceful world of commerce and friendship and sound standards of living for ourselves and for all others whom we can help to rise.

The World Church: News and Notes

The Church as a Pre-political Organization

Dr. J. H. Oldham, editor of *The Christian News-Letter*, recently made this statement: "The Church is not a political party, but it is a pre-political organization. Within the Church people should be able to discover the grounds upon which they make political, and indeed all other, decisions. The Church cannot enter the political firing-line, identifying itself with one political party, forming a party of its own, officially supporting a programme of its own. But it stands at the base: from it men and women derive their conception of justice, mercy, truth; their perception (always partial, always liable to be corrupted by sin) of the things which have to be fought against and fought for: to it they return for faith renewed and visions re-enlightened: within it common political judgments should take place. And disagreement between Christian people on means is no reflection upon the Gospel. It is pure fallacy that if all of us were fully Christian we should reach political unity, for it is as the fight proceeds that the vision grows."

Churchmen Executed After Plot on Hitler's Life

A number of active church laymen were executed in Germany after the July attempt on Hitler's life, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, revealed in an address before the British Council of Churches.

He indicated that the German Confessional Church is playing an active part in resistance to the Nazis, but said the full story of this activity cannot, "for security reasons," be told at present.

Both the Confessional Church and the Roman Catholic Church in Germany still exist as "spiritual entities" and are "definitely a spiritual power in the country," he said.

"The Confessional Church," he added, "is stronger than it was a few years ago. There is much greater unity within the church than formerly, and it has great evangelistic possibilities. Great missions have recently been held which brought a response comparable to that in the best days of the church. There has been a great revival of Bible study, especially by laymen. Many local churches deprived of clerical leadership have experienced a revival of lay leadership."

Discussing the role of churches in occupied countries, Dr. Visser 't Hooft stressed that an important phase of resistance was not what the churches said, "but what they have refused to say."

"One of the great struggles of the French Reformed Church," he recalled, "was to remain silent. Berlin sent a special representative to Paris to get a strong declaration against the Allied bombing policy, but he was told by the Reformed Church that they were not in

the habit of making declarations at the request of a temporal power."

Church resistance was primarily spiritual, but in some places, Dr. Visser 't Hooft declared, the church felt obligated to go further and become, for the first time in modern church history, a church on the offensive.

"Several churches," he said, "could very easily have bought for themselves a long period of quiet existence if they had been content to take no action except when their own normal church life was interfered with. The great thing is that several of them took aggressive action." (RNS)

Himmler on Protestantism and Catholicism

Protestantism and Roman Catholicism were listed as "ideological enemies" of Nazism by Gestapo Chief Heinrich Himmler in a recent secret speech to high German officers, text of which has reached the Office of War Information from "unquestionable sources."

Both the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, Himmler declared, are arrayed against the Nazis in the same manner as "Jewry, Free-masonry, Bolshevism, democracy, plutocracy, or whatever the various organizations may be called." (RNS)

First Protestant Religious Services Broadcast From Rome

Protestant religious services have been broadcast from Rome for the first time in history. A weekly Sunday quarter-hour program has been inaugurated in which speakers will be designated simply as Protestants, but plans are to have Waldensian ministers conduct two of every five programs. Broadcasts will be in Italian and will be exclusively for domestic listeners. (RNS)

The British Attitudes Toward Americans

The following paragraph of a letter from a British friend of *Christianity and Crisis* will interest our readers.

"It is difficult to sum up the British attitude to America. Contacts with American soldiers have worked both ways, but on the whole my impression is that relations have been friendly rather than unfriendly. It is too early to say what the total effect of the presence of so many American soldiers amongst us will have been. Ordinary folk like myself meet them chiefly in railway trains, and the general impression is favorable and friendly. But, on the whole, there has, I think, been very little real intimacy; relations have been correct and formal, rather than warmly cordial. One rarely sees British and American troops fraternizing in places where both are strolling around when off duty. They seem to treat one another with respect, but they do not

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

get together much. There seems to be no vocal anti-American feeling. I don't know whether such exists amongst, for example, captains of industry and those who fear trade competition. One does not meet it much. Everywhere the popular attitude toward Americans seems to be friendly—though this is not incompatible with quite a lot of humorous joking about (1) American ideals of efficiency; (2) ignorance of history, and (3) race-consciousness (attitudes to the British, Negroes, etc.). I think that all our stories about Americans could be classified under these three heads, and they are all good-natured and not meant to be taken very seriously. I think a very illuminating monograph could be written about these stories and anecdotes; it ought to be accompanied by a similar collection and analysis of American humor *vis-à-vis* Britain. Certain American entertainers, war correspondents, etc., are very popular on the wireless."

Religious Situation Among German Prisoners

There have been complaints about the lack of religious interest among the German prisoners of war. In this connection it is interesting to note the experience of the Swedish pastor Birger Forell in Normandy. He states that up to 90% of the German prisoners attended the services. There is a distinction to be made between infantry-men whose case is considered here, and the air-men and U-boat garrison who had been taken prisoners earlier and who, for the most part, had been drawn from fanatical members of the Nazi party, and were very inaccessible to the Christian message. (I.C.P.I.S. Geneva)

The foregoing paragraph is confirmed by the following experience of an American chaplain.

"Circulating among 2,900 German prisoners of war aboard a Navy transport during the voyage from Mediterranean ports to the United States, Lieut. Raymond G. Wickersham, Chaplain Corps, USNR, sounded them out on religion and found a spark of faith alive among them.

"Through one of the prisoners who had been a lawyer

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit 2, Mich. 650 1-45

and spoke English, he was told they had not been permitted to have religious gatherings of any kind—even a hymn-sing—while serving in the German Army.

"On the other hand, they said they did not look upon Nazism as a religion. They had not practiced neopaganism. They just hadn't worshipped. And a considerable number showed interest in the chaplain's survey, of whom 55 per cent professed to be Protestants and 45 per cent Catholics.

"Some of them requested prayer books or testaments. Chaplain Wickersham told them he had none printed in German. They replied that quite a few among them understood English. So he supplied about 100 of the booklets. Those who took this literature were mostly older German soldiers."

"Information Service" Analyzes Conscription Debate

The *Information Service* of the Federal Council of Churches devoted its issue of November 11th to an analysis of the argument for and against peace-time conscription. This publication should be very much more widely known among the churches. It assembles data on religious and social problems in a most convenient form and its analyses of important controversial issues are extraordinarily objective. It costs only two dollars a year.

A Communication

Gentlemen:

Never before have I written any publication agreeing or disagreeing with statements made therein. However, I do wish to commend you for your attitude expressed in a letter from Normandy (page 2 of August 7, 1944 issue). No one knows better than the Protestant chaplain how true it is that he has no one to back him officially. I have seen Protestant chaplains abused in favor of Roman chaplains, who, being organized and backed by the Roman Church have great power. Catholic officers sometimes discriminate against Protestant worship, too. Doubtless by the time the war is over (and too late for action) the Protestants will awaken to the situation and decide something should have been done about it. However, of course, now is the time action is needed.

Fraternally yours,

A CHAPLAIN.

Authors in This Issue:

The Rev. A. John Drewett is Vicar of St. John, Park, Sheffield, England, and is joint author of *WHAT IS CHRISTIAN EDUCATION?* and author of *THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY*. He is Sheffield Diocesan Inspector of Schools, and Chairman of the Education Committee of the Christian Auxiliary Movement.

Charles P. Taft is Director of the Office of Wartime Economic Affairs, Department of State. The article in this issue is a condensation of an address delivered by Mr. Taft before the annual convention of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., New York. We publish it here because it presents so adequate a conception of mutuality in international economic relationships.